arXiv:1210.1900v1 [math.OA] 6 Oct 2012

2-LOCAL DERIVATIONS ON MATRIX ALGEBRAS OVER COMMUTATIVE REGULAR ALGEBRAS

SH. A. AYUPOV, K. K. KUDAYBERGENOV, AND A. K. ALAUADINOV

Abstract. The paper is devoted to 2-local derivations on matrix algebras over commutative regular algebras. We give necessary and sufficient conditions on a commutative regular algebra to admit 2-local derivations which are not derivations. We prove that every 2-local derivation on a matrix algebra over a commutative regular algebra is a derivation.

1. Introduction

Given an algebra $\mathcal{A}$, a linear operator $D : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is called a *derivation*, if $D(xy) = D(x)y + xD(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ (the Leibniz rule). Each element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ implements a derivation D_a on $\mathcal{A}$ defined as $D_a(x) = [a, x] = ax-xa$, $x \in \mathcal{A}$. Such derivations D_a are said to be *inner derivations*. If the element a, implementing the derivation D_a, belongs to a larger algebra $\mathcal{B}$ containing $\mathcal{A}$, then D_a is called *a spatial derivation* on $\mathcal{A}$.

If the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative, then it is clear that all inner derivations are trivial, i.e. identically zero. One of the main problems concerning derivations is to prove that every derivation on a certain algebra is inner or spatial, or to show the existence on a given algebra of non inner (resp. non spatial) derivations, in particular the existence of non trivial derivations in the commutative case.

In the paper [9] A. F. Ber, V. I. Chilin and F. A. Sukochev obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of non trivial derivations on regular commutative algebras. In particular they have proved that the algebra $L^0(0,1)$ of all (equivalence classes of) complex measurable function on the $(0,1)$ interval admits non trivial derivations. It is clear that such derivations are discontinuous and non inner. We have conjectured in [1] that the existence of such "exotic" examples of derivations is closely connected with the commutative nature of these algebras. This was confirmed for the particular case of type I von Neumann algebras in [1], moreover we have investigated and completely described derivations on the algebra $LS(M)$ of all locally measurable operators affiliated with a type I or a type III von Neumann algebra M and on its various subalgebras [5].

There exist various types of linear operators which are close to derivations [14, 17, 21]. In particular R. Kadison [14] has introduced and investigated so-called local derivations on von Neumann algebras and some polynomial algebras.

A linear operator Δ on an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *local derivation* if given any $x \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a derivation D (depending on x) such that $\Delta(x) = D(x)$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47B47; Secondary 16W25.

Key words and phrases. derivation, 2-local derivation, regular algebra, matrix algebra.

The main problems concerning this notion are to find conditions under which local derivations become derivations and to present examples of algebras with local derivations that are not derivations. In particular Kadison [14] has proved that each continuous local derivation from a von Neumann algebra M into a dual M-bimodule is a derivation. In [12] it was proved that every local derivation on the algebra $M_n(R)$ is a derivation, where $M_n(R)$ is the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over a unital ring R containing $1/2$.

In [13], B. E. Johnson has extended Kadison's result and proved that every local derivation from a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into any Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule is a derivation. He also showed that every local derivation from a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into any Banach $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule is continuous. In [2] local derivations have been investigated on the algebra $S(M)$ of all measurable operators with respect a von Neumann algebra M. In particular, it was proved that for finite type I von Neumann algebras without abelian direct summands every local derivation on $S(M)$ is a derivation. Moreover, in the case of abelian von Neumann algebra M necessary and sufficient conditions have been obtained for the algebra $S(M)$ to admit local derivations which are not derivations.

In 1997, P. Semrl [21] introduced the concepts of 2-local derivations and 2-local automorphisms. A map $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ (not linear in general) is called a 2-*local derivation* if for every $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a derivation $D_{x,y} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ such that $\Delta(x) = D_{x,y}(x)$ and $\Delta(y) = D_{x,y}(y)$. Local and 2-local maps have been studied on different operator algebras by many authors [2, 7, 12, 14, 15, 17–23].

In [21], P. Semrl described 2-local derivations and automorphisms on the algebra $B(H)$ of all bounded linear operators on the infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert space H. A similar description for the finite-dimensional case appeared later in [15]. Recently in [6] we have considered 2-local derivations on the algebra $B(H)$ of all linear bounded operators on an arbitrary (no separability is assumed) Hilbert space H and proved that every 2-local derivation on $B(H)$ is a derivation. This result has been extended to arbitrary semi-finite von Neumann algebras in [4]. J. H. Zhang and H. X. Li [23] described 2-local derivations on symmetric digraph algebras and constructed a 2-local derivation which is not a derivation on the algebra of all upper triangular complex 2×2-matrices.

This paper is devoted to 2-local derivations on matrix algebras over commutative regular algebras.

Section 2 is devoted the problem of existence of 2-local derivations which are not derivations on algebras of measurable operators. We consider this problem on a class of commutative regular algebras, which include the algebras of measurable functions on a finite measure space (Theorem 2.8).

In section 3 we consider 2-local derivations on matrix algebras over commutative regular algebras. We prove that every 2-local derivation on a matrix algebra over a commutative regular algebra is a derivation (Theorem 3.3).

2. 2-LOCAL DERIVATIONS ON COMMUTATIVE REGULAR ALGEBRAS

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a commutative algebra with the unit $\mathbf{1}$ over the field $\mathbf{C}$ of complex numbers. We denote by ∇ the set $\{e \in \mathcal{A} : e^2 = e\}$ of all idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$. For

$e, f \in \nabla$ we set $e \leq f$ if $ef = e$. With respect to this partial order, to the lattice operations $e \vee f = e + f - ef,\ e \wedge f = ef$ and the complement $e^{\perp} = \mathbf{1} - e$, the set ∇ forms a Boolean algebra. A non zero element q from the Boolean algebra ∇ is called an *atom* if $0 \neq e \leq q,\ e \in \nabla$, imply that $e = q$. If given any nonzero $e \in \nabla$ there exists an atom q such that $q \leq e$, then the Boolean algebra ∇ is said to be *atomic*.

An algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is called *regular* (in the sense of von Neumann) if for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a = aba$.

Further, we shall always assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital commutative regular algebra over $\mathbf{C}$, and that ∇ is the Boolean algebra of all its idempotents. In this case given any element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists an idempotent $e \in \nabla$ such that $ea = a$, and if $ga = a, g \in \nabla$, then $e \leq g$. This idempotent is called the *support* of a and denoted by $s(a)$.

Suppose that μ is a strictly positive countably additive finite measure on the Boolean algebra ∇ of idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$ and consider the metric $\rho(a, b) = \mu(s(a - b)),\ a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, on the algebra $\mathcal{A}$. From now on we shall assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ is a complete metric space (cf. [9]).

Example 2.1. The most important example of a complete commutative regular algebra $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ is the algebra $\mathcal{A} = L^0(\Omega) = L^0(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ of all (classes of equivalence of) measurable complex functions on a measure space (Ω, Σ, μ), where μ is finite countably additive measure on Σ, and $\rho(a, b) = \mu(s(a - b)) = \mu(\{\omega \in \Omega : a(\omega) \neq b(\omega)\})$ (see for details [3, Lemma] and [9, Example 2.5]).

Remark 2.2. If (Ω, Σ, μ) is a general localizable measure space, i.e. the measure μ (not finite in general) has the finite sum property, then the algebra $L^0(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is a unital regular algebra, but $\rho(a, b) = \mu(s(a - b))$ is not a metric in general. But one can represent Ω as a union of pair-wise disjoint measurable sets with finite measures and thus this algebra is a direct sum of commutative regular complete metrizable algebras from the above example.

Following [9] we say that an element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is *finitely valued* (respectively, *countably valued*) if $a = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k e_k$, where $\alpha_k \in \mathbf{C}$, $e_k \in \nabla,\ e_k e_j = 0,\ k \neq j,\ k, j = 1, ..., n,\ n \in \mathbf{N}$ (respectively, $a = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{\omega} \alpha_k e_k$, where $\alpha_k \in \mathbf{C}$, $e_k \in \nabla,\ e_k e_j = 0,\ k \neq j,\ k, j = 1, ..., \omega$, where ω is a natural number or ∞ (in the latter case the convergence of series is understood with respect to the metric ρ)). We denote by $K(\nabla)$ (respectively, by $K_c(\nabla)$) the set of all finitely valued (respectively, countably valued) elements in $\mathcal{A}$. It is known that $\nabla \subset K(\nabla) \subset K_c(\nabla)$, both $K(\nabla)$ and $K_c(\nabla)$ are regular subalgebras in $\mathcal{A}$, and moreover the closure of $K(\nabla)$ in $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ coincides with $K_c(\nabla)$ (see [9, Proposition 2.8]).

Further everywhere we assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital commutative regular algebra over $\mathbf{C}$ and μ is a strictly positive countably additive finite measure on the Boolean algebra ∇ of all idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is complete in the metric $\rho(a, b) = \mu(s(a - b)),\ a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

It is well-known [9] that the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ admits a non-zero derivation if and only if $K_c(\nabla) \neq \mathcal{A}$. Note that $\delta|_{K_c(\nabla)} = 0$ for any derivation δ on $\mathcal{A}$.

First we recall some further notions from the paper [9].

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a unital subalgebra in the algebra $\mathcal{A}$. An element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is called:

– *algebraic with respect to* $\mathcal{B}$, if there exists a polynomial $p \in \mathcal{B}[x]$ (i.e. a polynomial on x with the coefficients from $\mathcal{B}$), such that $p(a) = 0$;

– *integral with respect to* $\mathcal{B}$, if there exists a unitary polynomial $p \in \mathcal{B}[x]$ (i.e. the coefficient of the largest degree of x in $p(x)$ is equal to $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{B}$), such that $p(a) = 0$;

– *transcendental with respect to* $\mathcal{B}$, if a is not algebraic with respect to $\mathcal{B}$;

– *weakly transcendental with respect to* $\mathcal{A}$, if $a \neq 0$ and for any non-zero idempotent $e \leq s(a)$ the element ea is not integral with respect to $\mathcal{B}$.

Integral closure of a subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ is the set of all integral elements with respect to $\mathcal{B}$; is denoted as $\mathcal{B}^{(i)}$. It is known (see e.g. [10]) that $\mathcal{B}^{(i)}$ is also a subalgebra in $\mathcal{A}$.

Further let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital commutative regular algebra over $\mathbf{C}$ and let μ be a strictly positive countably additive finite measure on the Boolean algebra ∇ of all idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is complete in the metric $\rho(a, b) = \mu(s(a - b)),\ a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a regular ρ-closed subalgebra in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\nabla \subset \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{(i)}$, where $\mathcal{B}^{(i)}$ is the integral closure of $\mathcal{B}$. Then for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists idempotent $e_a \in \nabla$ such that*

i) $e_a a \in \mathcal{B}$;

ii) if $e_a \neq \mathbf{1}$ then $(\mathbf{1} - e_a)a$ is a transcendental element with respect to $\mathcal{B}$.

Proof. Put

$$\nabla_a = \{e \in \nabla : ea \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Take $e_1, e_2 \in \nabla_a$, i.e. $e_1 a, e_2 a \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $\nabla \subset \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $(e_1^{\perp} \wedge e_2)a \in \mathcal{B}$. Further $\mathcal{B}$ is a subalgebra and therefore

$$(e_1 \vee e_2)a = e_1 a + (e_1^{\perp} \wedge e_2)a \in \mathcal{B},$$

i.e. $e_1 \vee e_2 \in \nabla_a$.

Denote

$$e_a = \bigvee \nabla_a.$$

Since ∇ is a Boolean algebra with the finite measure μ there exists a sequence of idempotents $\{e_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in ∇_a such that $\bigvee\limits_{n \in \mathbb{N}} e_n = e_a$. Since $e_n a \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows that $\bigvee\limits_{n=1}^{m} e_n a \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is clear that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \rho\left(\bigvee_{n=1}^{m} e_n a, e_a a\right) \to 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{B}$ is ρ-closed it follows that $e_a a \in \mathcal{B}$.

Now we suppose that $e_a \neq \mathbf{1}$. Let $0 \neq e \leq e_a^{\perp}$. If ea is an integral element with respect to $\mathcal{B}$ then by the equality $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{(i)}$ we have that $ea \in \mathcal{B}$, i.e. $e \leq e_a$, which contradicts with $0 \neq e \leq e_a^{\perp}$. Thus $e_a^{\perp}$ is a weakly transcendental element with respect to $\mathcal{B}$. The proof is complete. □

Now recall the definition of algebraically independent subset over commutative regular algebras (see for details [10]).

Let $F[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ be the algebra of all polynomials of n variables over a field F. A monomial $q(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ is said to be included to a polynomial $p(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\in F[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$, if the natural representation of $p(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ as a sum of monomials with non zero coefficients contains the monomial q (natural representation means such representation that any two different monomials have different degrees of variables).

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a commutative regular algebra over the field F. A subset $\mathcal{M}$ is called algebraically independent if for any $a_1,\ldots,a_n\in\mathcal{M}$, $e\in\nabla$, $p\in F[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ the equality $ep(x_1,\ldots,x_n)=0$ implies that $eq(x_1,\ldots,x_n)=0$, where $q\in F[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ is an arbitrary monomial included to the polynomial p.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a field then this definition coincides with the well-known definition algebraically independence of subsets over the field.

Note that in the case of f-algebras the notion of algebraic independence of subsets coincides with the algebraic independence of subsets introduced by A.G. Kusraev in [16].

Lemma 2.4. *Let $a,b\in\mathcal{A}$ and let $s(a)=s(b)=\mathbf{1}$. If the subset $\{a,b\}$ is algebraically independent then the subset $\{a,a+b\}$ is also algebraically independent.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{a,a+b\}$ is not algebraically independent. Then by [10, Proposition 4] it follows that $a+b$ is not weakly transcendental element with respect to the subalgebra $F(a,\nabla)$, generated by the element a and ∇. Therefore there exists a non zero idempotent $e\leq s(a+b)$ such that $e(a+b)$ is an integral element with respect to $F(a,\nabla)$, i.e. there are elements $c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_n\in F(a,\nabla)$ such that

$$(e(a+b))^n+c_1(e(a+b))^{n-1}+\ldots+c_{n-1}(e(a+b))+c_n=0.$$

By decomposing $(e(a+b))^k$, $k=\overline{1,n}$, the last equality can be represented in the form

$$(eb)^n+d_1(eb)^{n-1}+\ldots+d_{n-1}(eb)+d_n=0,$$

where $d_1,d_2,\ldots,d_n\in F(a,\nabla)$. This means that eb is an integral element with respect to $F(a,\nabla)$. Since $s(a)=\mathbf{1}$ it follows that b is not weakly transcendental with respect to $F(a,\nabla)$.

On other hand, since $\{a,b\}$ is an algebraically independent subset, by [10, Proposition 4] we have that b is weakly transcendental with respect to $F(a,\nabla)$. From this contradiction we have that $\{a,a+b\}$ is an algebraically independent subset. The proof is complete. □

Definition 2.5. For $x\in\mathcal{A}$ denote:

— $\mathcal{A}_0=F(x,\nabla)$ is the subalgebra in $\mathcal{A}$, generated by x and ∇;

— $\mathcal{A}_1$ is the smallest regular subalgebra in $\mathcal{A}$, contained $\mathcal{A}_0$;

— $\mathcal{A}_2$ is the closure of $\mathcal{A}_1$ by the metric ρ;

— $\mathcal{A}_3$ is the integral closure of $\mathcal{A}_2$;

— $\mathcal{A}_x$ is the closure of $\mathcal{A}_3$ by the metric ρ.

Lemma 2.6. *If there is an element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ weakly transcendental with respect to $K_c(\nabla)$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_a$, where $\mathcal{A}_a$ is the subalgebra constructed with respect to a by definition 2.5, then any 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ is a derivation.*

Proof. Let a be a weakly transcendental element with respect to $K_c(\nabla)$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_a$ and let Δ be a 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}$. Since any derivation on regular commutative algebra $\mathcal{A}$ does not expand the support of elements (see [9, Proposition 2.3]), we have that $s(\Delta(x)) \leq s(x), x \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let us show that there exists a unique derivation D on $\mathcal{A}$ such that $D(a) = \Delta(a)$. First consider the trivial (identically zero) derivation D on $K(\nabla)$. Since a is weakly transcendental with respect to $K_c(\nabla)$ and $s(\Delta(a)) \leq s(a)$, [9, Proposition 3.7] implies that D has a unique extension (which is also denoted by D) onto $\mathcal{A}_0$ such that$D(a) = \Delta(a)$; Further following [9, Proposition 2.5] we can extend D in a unique way onto $\mathcal{A}_1$; and then by [9, Proposition 2.6 (vi)] it can be uniquely extended onto $\mathcal{A}_2$. Further, in view of [10, Proposition 2] D has a unique extension onto $\mathcal{A}_3$; and finally, applying [9, Proposition 2.6 (vi)] once more we extend it (uniquely) onto $\mathcal{A}_a = \mathcal{A}$.

Now let x be an arbitrary element from $\mathcal{A}$. Since Δ is a 2-local derivation there is derivation δ (depending on x and a) such that

$$\Delta(x) = \delta(x), \, \Delta(a) = \delta(a).$$

Thus $\delta(a) = \Delta(a) = D(a)$. Since D is a unique derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ with $\Delta(a) = D(a)$, it follows that $\delta \equiv D$. In particular,

$$\Delta(x) = \delta(x) = D(x),$$

i.e. $\Delta \equiv D$. This means that Δ is a derivation. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.7. *If there exist two algebraically independent elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ with $s(a) = s(b)$, then the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ admits a 2-local derivation which is not a derivation.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist algebraically independent elements a, b such that $s(a) = s(b) = \mathbf{1}$. Denote by $\mathcal{A}_a$ and $\mathcal{A}_b$ of the subalgebras in $\mathcal{A}$, constructed with respect to elements $x = a$ and $x = b$, respectively, by definition 2.5.

Since a is a weakly transcendental element with respect to $K_c(\nabla)$, by [10, Proposition 2] there exists a derivation D on $\mathcal{A}_a$ such that $\Delta(a) = \mathbf{1}$. Algebraically independence of the subset $\{a, b\}$ and [10, Proposition 4] imply that b is a weakly transcendental element with respect to the subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_a$. Therefore, again using [10, Proposition 2] we can extend the derivation D with value $D(b) = \mathbf{1}$ to the subalgebra generated by $\mathcal{A}_a$ and b. Now using [9, Theorem 3.1] we can extended the derivation D on whole $\mathcal{A}$. Hence there is a derivation D on $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$D(a) = D(b) = \mathbf{1}.$$

Now on the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ define the operator Δ as follows:

$$\Delta(x) = (e_a(x) \vee e_b(x))D(x), \, x \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $e_a(x)$ (respectively $e_b(x)$) is the largest idempotent such that $e_a(x)x \in \mathcal{A}_a$ (respectively $e_b(x) \in \mathcal{A}_b$) (see Lemma 2.3).

Let us show that Δ is a 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ which is not a derivation.

First we check that Δ is a 2-local derivation.

Take $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. Consider the following three cases.

Case 1. $e_a(x) \vee e_b(x) = \mathbf{1}, e_a(y) \vee e_b(y) = \mathbf{1}$. Then

$$\Delta(x) = D(x),\ \Delta(y) = D(y).$$

Case 2. $e_a(x) \vee e_b(x) = 0, e_a(y) \vee e_b(y) = 0$. Then

$$\Delta(x) = 0,\ \Delta(y) = 0.$$

Therefore for trivial derivation D_0 we have that

$$\Delta(x) = D_0(x),\ \Delta(y) = D_0(y).$$

Case 3. $e_a(x) \vee e_b(x) = \mathbf{1}, e_a(y) \vee e_b(y) = 0$. Without loss generality we can assume that $e_a(x) \neq 0$. Since $e_a(y) = 0$, Lemma 2.3 implies that the element $e_a(x)y$ is weakly transcendental with respect to $e_a(x)\mathcal{A}_a$. Therefore by [9, Proposition 3.7] there exists a derivation D_1 on the subalgebra generated by $e_a(x)\mathcal{A}_a$ and $e_a(x)y$ such that

$$D_1|_{e_a(x)\mathcal{A}_a} = D|_{e_a(x)\mathcal{A}_a},\ D_1(e_a(x)y) = 0.$$

Now by [9, Theorem 3.1] we extend this derivation on whole $\mathcal{A}$, and denote the extension also by D_1.

Similarly there exists a derivation D_2 on $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$D_2|_{e_b(x)\mathcal{A}_b} = D|_{e_b(x)\mathcal{A}_b},\ D_2(e_b(x)y) = 0.$$

Put $D_3 = e_a(x)D_1 + e_a(x)^\perp D_2$. Then

$$\Delta(x) = D(x) = D(e_a(x)x + e_a(x)^\perp x) =$$

$$= e_a(x)D(x) + e_a(x)^\perp D(x) = e_a(x)D_1(x) + e_a(x)^\perp D_2(x) = D_3(x)$$

and

$$\Delta(y) = 0 = e_a(x)D_1(y) + e_b(x)^\perp D_2(y) = D_3(y).$$

Thus

$$\Delta(x) = D_3(x),\ \Delta(y) = D_3(y).$$

Now let x and y be arbitrary elements of $\mathcal{A}$. Put

$$e_1 = e_a(x) \vee e_b(x),\ e_2 = e_a(y) \vee e_b(y)$$

and

$$p_1 = e_1 \wedge e_2,\ p_2 = e_1 \wedge e_2^\perp,\ p_3 = e_1^\perp \wedge e_1,\ p_4 = (e_1 \vee e_2)^\perp.$$

Then $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 = \mathbf{1}$. Consider the restriction Δ_i of the 2-local derivation Δ on $p_i\mathcal{A}$, $i = \overline{1,4}$. The idempotents $e_{p_1 a}(p_1 x) \vee e_{p_1 b}(p_1 x)$ and $e_{p_1 a}(p_1 y) \vee e_{p_1 b}(p_1 y)$, corresponding to the elements $p_1 x$ and $p_1 y$, by Lemma 2.3, with respect to the subalgebras $p_1\mathcal{A}_{p_1 a}$, $p_1\mathcal{A}_{p_1 b}$ are equal to p_1 (p_1 is the unit in $p_1\mathcal{A}$). Therefore by the case 1 there exists a derivation D_1 on $p_1\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$p_1\Delta(p_1 x) = p_1 D_1(p_1 x),\ p_1\Delta(p_1 y) = p_1 D_1(p_1 y).$$

Similarly we consider the 2-local derivations $p_2\Delta$ and $p_3\Delta$, which correspond to the case 3, and the 2-local derivation $p_4\Delta$ which corresponds to the case 2. Take the corresponding derivations D_i on $p_i\mathcal{A}$, $i=\overline{1,4}$ with

$$p_i\Delta(p_ix)=p_iD_i(p_ix),\ p_i\Delta(p_iy)=p_iD_i(p_iy).$$

Put $D_5=D_1+D_2+D_3+D_4$. Then

$$\Delta(x)=D_5(x),\ \Delta(y)=D_5(y).$$

Now we show that Δ is not a derivation. It is sufficient show that Δ is not an additive. Indeed, by Lemma 2.4 the subset $\{a,a+b\}$ is an algebraically independent subset. Hence $a+b$ is a weakly transcendental element with respect to the subalgebra generated by a and ∇. Thus $e_a(a+b)=0$. In the same way we can show that $e_b(a+b)=0$. Therefore

$$\Delta(a+b)=(e_a(a+b)\vee e_b(a+b))D(x)=0.$$

On other hand,

$$\Delta(a)=\Delta(b)=\mathbf{1}.$$

Thus

$$\Delta(a)+\Delta(b)\neq\Delta(a+b).$$

The proof is complete. □

The following theorem the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital commutative regular algebra over $\mathbf{C}$ and let μ be a strictly positive countably additive finite measure on the Boolean algebra ∇ of all idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is complete in the metric $\rho(a,b)=\mu(s(a-b))$, $a,b\in\mathcal{A}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

i) any 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ is a derivation;

ii) either $\mathcal{A}=K_c(\nabla)$ or there exists an element a weakly transcendental with respect to $K_c(\nabla)$ such that $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_a$, where $\mathcal{A}_a$ is the subalgebra constructed with respect to a by definition 2.5.

Proof. *ii)* $\Rightarrow$ *i)*. First let us consider the case when $\mathcal{A}=K_c(\nabla)$. Since each derivation on $K_c(\nabla)$ is identically zero,it follows that each 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}=K_c(\nabla)$ is also trivial. Therefore every 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ is a derivation.

Now suppose that there exists an element $a\in\mathcal{A}$ weakly transcendental with respect to $K_c(\nabla)$ such that $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_a$. Then by Lemma 2.6 each 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ is a derivation.

i) $\Rightarrow$ *ii)*. Suppose that *ii)* is not true. Then $\mathcal{A}\neq K_c(\nabla)$. For arbitrary $x\notin\mathcal{A}\setminus K_c(\nabla)$ set

$$e(x)=\mathbf{1}-\bigvee\{e\in\nabla: ex\in K_c(\nabla)\}.$$

Then

$$ex\notin\mathcal{A}\setminus K_c(\nabla),\ \forall\, 0\neq e\leq e(x).$$

Denote

$$e_t=\bigvee\{e(x)\in\nabla: x\in\mathcal{A}\setminus K_c(\nabla)\}.$$

Then

$$e_t^{\perp}\mathcal{A}=e_t^{\perp}K_c(\nabla). \tag{2.2}$$

Since ∇ – is a Boolean algebra with a finite measure, there exists a sequence $\{e(x_n)\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that

$$e_t = \bigvee_{n\geq 1} e(x_n).$$

Put

$$e_1 = e(x_1),\ e_n = e(x_n) \wedge (e_1 \vee \cdots \vee e_{n-1})^{\perp},\ n \geq 2$$

and

$$x_t = \sum_{n\geq 1} e_n x_n.$$

Then

$$ex_t \notin \mathcal{A} \setminus K_c(\nabla),\ \forall\, 0 \neq e \leq e_t.$$

Since we assumed that $ii)$ is false, this implies that

$$\mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{A}_{x_t}.$$

Take $y \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{x_t}$. From (2.2) it follows that $e_0 = s(y) \wedge e_t \neq 0$. Denote

$$a = e_0 x_t,\ b = e_0 y.$$

Then $s(a) = s(b)$. By construction b is weakly transcendental with respect to $\mathcal{A}_{x_t}$, and hence [10, Proposition 4] implies that the set $\{a, b\}$ is algebraically independent. Therefore there exist algebraically independent elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $s(a) = s(b)$. Thus Lemma 2.7 implies that the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ admits 2-local derivation which is not a derivation. The proof is complete. □

Now we can consider the problem of existence of 2-local derivations which are not derivations on algebras of measurable operators with respect to commutative von Neumann algebras.

It is well known that if M is a commutative von Neumann algebra with a faithful normal semifinite trace τ, then M is $*$-isomorphic to the algebra $L^{\infty}(\Omega) = L^{\infty}(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ of all essentially bounded measurable complex valued function on an appropriate localizable measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) and $\tau(f) = \int\limits_{\Omega} f(t)d\mu(t)$ for $f \in L^{\infty}(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$. In this case the algebra $S(M)$ of all measurable operators affiliated with M may be identified with the algebra $L^0(\Omega) = L^0(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ of all measurable complex valued functions on (Ω, Σ, μ). In general the algebra $S(M)$ is not metrizable. But considering Ω as a union of pairwise disjoint measurable sets with finite measures we obtain that $S(M)$ is a direct sum of commutative regular algebras metrizable in the above sense (see Remark 2.2). Therefore using Theorem 2.8 we obtain the following solution of the problem concerning the existence of 2-local derivations which are not derivations on algebras of measurable operator in the commutative case.

Theorem 2.9. *Let M be a commutative von Neumann algebra. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) the lattice $P(M)$ of projections in M is not atomic;

(ii) the algebra $S(M)$ admits a 2-local derivation which is not a derivation.

Proof. $i) \Rightarrow ii)$. Suppose that $P(M)$ is not atomic. Then the algebra $S(M)$ contains a $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ which is $*$-isomorphic with the $*$-algebra $L^0(0,1)$ of all measurable complex valued functions on $(0,1)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathcal{B}$ contains the unit of $S(M)$. By [10, Lemma 2] the algebra $\mathcal{B}$ contains algebraically independent elements a, b with $s(a) = s(b) = \mathbf{1}$. By [10, Theorem 1] there exists a derivation D on $\mathcal{B}$ such that $D(a) = 0$, $D(b) = \mathbf{1}$. Following [9, Theorem 3.1] we extend D onto $S(M)$, the extension is also denoted by D.

Now let us show that $\{a, b\}$ is an algebraically independent subset in $S(M)$. Suppose the converse, i.e. $\{a, b\}$ is not algebraically independent in $S(M)$. Then by [10, Proposition 4] b is not weakly transcendental with respect to $R(a, \nabla)$, where $R(a, \nabla)$ is the smallest regular ρ-closed subalgebra in $S(M)$, generated by a and ∇. This means that there exist an idempotent e with $0 \neq e \leq s(b) = \mathbf{1}$ such that eb is an integral element with respect to $R(a, \nabla)$. Consider the subalgebra $F(eb, R(a, \nabla))$, generated by eb and $R(a, \nabla)$. Let δ denote the trivial derivation on $F(eb, R(a, \nabla))$. By [9, Proposition 3.6] δ is the unique derivation on $F(eb, R(a, \nabla))$ with $\delta|_{R(a,\nabla)} = 0$. Since $D(a) = 0$, it follows that $D|_{R(a,\nabla)} = 0$. Therefore $\delta = D|_{F(eb,R(a,\nabla))}$, and in particular, $D(eb) = 0$. This is a contradiction with $D(eb) = eD(b) = e \neq 0$. This contradiction shows that $\{a, b\}$ is an algebraically independent set in $S(M)$. Now Theorem 2.8 implies that the algebra $S(M)$ admits a 2-local derivation which is not a derivation.

$ii) \Rightarrow i)$. Suppose that $P(M)$ is atomic. Then by [10, Theorem 3.1] every derivation on $S(M)$ is identically zero. Therefore each 2-local derivation on $S(M)$ is also trivial, i.e. a derivation. The proof is complete.

□

3. 2-Local derivations on matrix algebras

In this section we shall investigate 2-local derivations on matrix algebras over commutative regular algebras.

As in the previous section let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital commutative regular algebra over $\mathbf{C}$ and let μ be a strictly positive countably additive finite measure on the Boolean algebra ∇ of all idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is complete in the metric $\rho(a, b) = \mu(s(a - b)),\ a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

It is well-known [9] that the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ admits a non-zero derivation if and only if $K_c(\nabla) \neq \mathcal{A}$.

Let $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ be the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}$. We identify the center of the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ with $\mathcal{A}$. If $e_{i,j}$, $i, j = \overline{1, n}$, are the matrix units in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, then each element $x \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ has the form

$$x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} f_{ij} e_{ij},\ f_{ij} \in \mathcal{A},\ i, j = \overline{1, n}.$$

Let $\delta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ be a derivation. Setting

$$D_\delta\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} f_{ij} e_{ij}\right) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \delta(f_{ij}) e_{ij} \tag{3.1}$$

we obtain a well-defined linear operator D_δ on the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover D_δ is a derivation on the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and its restriction onto the center of the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ coincides with the given δ.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ be the algebra of $n\times n$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}$. Every derivation D on the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ can be uniquely represented as a sum*

$$D = D_a + D_\delta, \tag{3.2}$$

where D_a is an inner derivation implemented by an element $a \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ while D_δ is the derivation of the form (3.1) generated by a derivation δ on $\mathcal{A}$.

In [1, Lemma 2.2] this assertion has been proved for the case of algebras $\mathcal{A} = L^0(\Omega)$, but the proof is the same for general commutative regular algebras $\mathcal{A}$.

The proof of the following result directly follows from the definition of 2-local derivations.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be an algebra with the center $Z(\mathcal{B})$ and let $\Delta : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}$ be a 2-local derivation. Then*

(1) $\Delta(zx) = z\Delta(x)$ *for all central idempotent* $z \in Z(\mathcal{B})$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{B}$;
(2) $\Delta(x^2) = \Delta(x)x + x\Delta(x)$ *for all* $x \in \mathcal{B}$.

The following theorem the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Every 2-local derivation $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \to M_n(\mathcal{A})$ is a derivation.*

For the proof of the Theorem 3.3 we need several Lemmata.

For $x \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ by x_{ij} we denote the (i,j)-entry of x, i.e. $e_{ii}xe_{jj} = x_{ij}e_{ij}$, where $1 \leq i,j \leq n$.

Lemma 3.4. *For every 2-local derivation Δ on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ there exists a derivation D such that $\Delta(e_{ij}) = D(e_{ij})$ for all $i,j \in \overline{1,n}$.*

Proof. (cf. [15, Theorem 3]). We define two matrices $d, q \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$d = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2^i} e_{ii}, \; q = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{i,i+1}.$$

It is easy to see that an element $x \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ commutes with d if and only if it is diagonal, and if an element u commutes with q, then u is of the form

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & u_2 & u_3 & . & . & u_n \\ 0 & u_1 & u_2 & . & . & u_{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & u_1 & . & . & u_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & . & u_1 & u_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & . & 0 & u_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Take a derivation D on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\Delta(d) = D(d), \, \Delta(q) = D(q).$$

Replacing Δ by $\Delta - D$ if necessary, we can assume that $\Delta(d) = \Delta(q) = 0$.

Let $i, j \in \overline{1, n}$. Take a derivation $D = D_h + D_\delta$ represented as in Lemma 3.1 and such that

$$\Delta(e_{ij}) = D(e_{ij}),\ \Delta(d) = D(d).$$

Since $\Delta(d) = 0$ and $D_\delta(d) = 0$ it follows that $0 = D_h(d) = hd - dh$. Therefore h has diagonal form, i.e. $h = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} h_i e_{ii}$. So we have

$$\Delta(e_{ij}) = he_{ij} - e_{ij}h.$$

In the same way starting with the element q instead of d, we obtain

$$\Delta(e_{ij}) = ue_{ij} - e_{ij}u,$$

where u is of the above form, depending on e_{ij}. So

$$\Delta(e_{ij}) = he_{ij} - e_{ij}h = ue_{ij} - e_{ij}u.$$

Since

$$he_{ij} - e_{ij}h = (h_i - h_j)e_{ij}$$

and

$$[ue_{ij} - e_{ij}u]_{ij} = 0$$

it follows that $\Delta(e_{ij}) = 0$. The proof is complete. □

Further in Lemmata 3.5–3.12 we assume that Δ is a 2-local derivation on the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, $n > 1$ such that $\Delta(e_{ij}) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \overline{1, n}$.

Lemma 3.5. *For every $x \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ there exist derivations $\delta_{ij} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$, $i, j \in \overline{1, n}$ such that*

$$\Delta(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \delta_{ij}(x_{ij})e_{ij}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Let $D_{x,e_{ij}}$ be a derivation on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\Delta(x) = D_{x,e_{ij}}(x),\ \Delta(e_{ij}) = D_{x,e_{ij}}(e_{ij}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} e_{ij}\Delta(x)e_{ij} = e_{ij}D_{x,e_{ij}}(x)e_{ij} = \\ = D_{x,e_{ij}}(e_{ij}xe_{ij}) - D_{x,e_{ij}}(e_{ij})xe_{ij} - xe_{ij}D_{x,e_{ij}}(e_{ij}) = \\ = D_{x,e_{ij}}(x_{ji}e_{ij}) = D_{x,e_{ij}}(x_{ji})e_{ij} + x_{ji}D_{x,e_{ij}}(e_{ij}) = \\ = \delta_{ji}(x_{ji})e_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$e_{ij}\Delta(x)e_{ij} = \delta_{ji}(x_{ji})e_{ij}.$$

Multiplying the last equality from the left side by e_{ji} and from the right side by e_{ji} we obtain

$$e_{jj}\Delta(x)e_{ii} = \delta_{ji}(x_{ji})e_{ji}$$

for all $i, j \in \overline{1, n}$. Summing these equalities for all $i, j \in \overline{1, n}$ we get

$$\Delta(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \delta_{ij}(x_{ij})e_{ij}.$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let*

$$x=\sum_{i=1}^n f_i e_{ii},\ y=\sum_{i=1}^n g_i e_{ii},$$

where $f_i, g_i \in \mathcal{A}$ *for all* $i\in\overline{1,n}$. *Then there exists a derivation* δ *on* $\mathcal{A}$ *such that*

$$\Delta(x)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta(f_i)e_{ii},\ \Delta(y)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta(g_i)e_{ii}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. By (3.3) for $i\neq j$ we obtain that

$$\Delta(x)_{ij}=\Delta(y)_{ij}=0.$$

Take a derivation D on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\Delta(x)=D(x),\ \Delta(y)=D(y).$$

By Lemma 3.1 there exist an element $a\in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and a derivation $\delta:\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{A}$ such that $D=D_a+D_\delta$. Then

$$\Delta(x)_{ii}=D(x)_{ii}=D_a(x)_{ii}+D_\delta(x)_{ii}=$$
$$=[ax-xa]_{ii}+\delta(f_i)=\delta(f_i)$$

and

$$\Delta(y)_{ii}=D(y)_{ii}=D_a(y)_{ii}+D_\delta(y)_{ii}=$$
$$=[ay-ya]_{ii}+\delta(g_i)=\delta(g_i),$$

because x, y are diagonal matrices and therefore

$$[ax-xa]_{ii}=[ay-ya]_{ii}=0.$$

So

$$\Delta(x)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta(f_i)e_{ii},\ \Delta(y)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta(g_i)e_{ii}.$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.7. *The restriction* $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a derivation.*

Proof. Put

$$x=\sum_{i=1}^n fe_{ii},\ y=\sum_{i=1}^n ge_{ii},$$

$$z=\sum_{i=1}^n (f+g)e_{ii},\ w=fe_{11}+\sum_{i=2}^n ge_{ii},$$

where $f,g\in\mathcal{A}$. Using (3.4) we can find derivations $\delta_{x,w},\delta_{y,w},\delta_{z,w}$ on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\Delta(x)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x,w}(f)e_{ii},\ \Delta(y)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{y,w}(g)e_{ii},\ \Delta(z)=\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z,w}(f+g)e_{ii},$$

$$\Delta(w)=\delta_{x,w}(f)e_{11}+\sum_{i=2}^n \delta_{x,w}(g)e_{ii}=$$

$$= \delta_{y,w}(f)e_{11} + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \delta_{y,w}(g)e_{ii} = \delta_{z,w}(f)e_{11} + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \delta_{z,w}(g)e_{ii}.$$

Then

$$\Delta(x+y) = \Delta(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{z,w}(f+g)e_{ii} =$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{z,w}(f)e_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{z,w}(g)e_{ii} =$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x,w}(f)e_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{y,w}(g)e_{ii} = \Delta(x) + \Delta(y).$$

Hence

$$\Delta(x+y) = \Delta(x) + \Delta(y).$$

So the restriction of Δ on the $\mathcal{A}$ is an additive and therefore, $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a linear Jordan derivation on $\mathcal{A}$ in the sense of [11]. In [11, Theorem 1] it is proved that any Jordan derivation on a semi-prime algebra is a derivation. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is regular, it is obviously semi-prime, and therefore the linear operator $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a derivation on $\mathcal{A}$. The proof is complete. □

Further in Lemmata 3.8–3.12 we assume that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let*

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i e_{ii},$$

where $f_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. *Then* $\Delta(x) = 0$.

Proof. We fix a number k and take the element $y = f_k$. By Lemma 3.6 there exists a derivation δ on $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\Delta(x) = D_\delta(x),\ \Delta(y) = D_\delta(y).$$

Since $\Delta(y) = 0$ it follows that

$$0 = \Delta(y)_{11} = \delta(f_k).$$

i.e. $\delta(f_k) = 0$. Further

$$\Delta(x)_{kk} = \delta(f_k) = 0.$$

Since k is an arbitrary number, it follows that $\Delta(x) = 0$. The proof is complete. □

In Lemmata 3.9-3.11 let x be an arbitrary element from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$.

Lemma 3.9. $\Delta(x)_{kk} = 0$ *for every* $k \in \overline{1,n}$.

Proof. We take an element

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i e_{ii}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $f_1 = x_{kk}$, $f_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $2 \leq i \leq n$, $s(f_i - f_j) = \mathbf{1}$, $i \neq j$. Choose a derivation $D = D_a + D_\delta$ such that

$$\Delta(x) = D(x),\ \Delta(y) = D(y).$$

By Lemma 3.8 we get $\Delta(y) = 0$. Then

$$0 = \Delta(y)_{11} = D_a(y)_{11} + D_\delta(y)_{11} =$$

$$= [ay - ya]_{11} + \delta(x_{kk}) = a_{11}f_1 - f_1a_{11} + \delta(x_{kk}) = \delta(x_{kk}),$$

i.e. $\delta(x_{kk}) = 0$. If $i \neq j$ then

$$\Delta(y)_{ij} = (f_i - f_j)a_{ij}.$$

Therefore

$$(f_i - f_j)a_{ij} = 0.$$

Since $s(f_i - f_j) = \mathbf{1}$ it follows that $a_{ij} = 0$. So a has a diagonal form, i.e.

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ii}e_{ii}. \tag{3.6}$$

Thus

$$\Delta(x)_{kk} = [ax - xa]_{kk} + \delta(x_{kk}) =$$

$$= a_{kk}x_{kk} - x_{kk}a_{kk} = 0,$$

i.e.

$$\Delta(x)_{kk} = 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

In following two lemmata we assume that the indices i and j are fixed.

Lemma 3.10. *If* $x_{ji} = \mathbf{1}$ $(i \neq j)$ *then* $\Delta(x)_{ij} = 0$.

Proof. Choose an element $y \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ of the form (3.5) with $f_1 = x_{ij}$ and a derivation $D = D_a + D_\delta$ such that

$$\Delta(x) = D(x),\ \Delta(y) = D(y).$$

Since $\Delta(y) = 0$ it follows that a has the form (3.6) and $\delta(x_{ij}) = 0$. Then

$$\Delta(x)_{ji} = (a_{jj} - a_{ii})x_{ji} + \delta(x_{ji}) = (a_{jj} - a_{ii}) + \delta(\mathbf{1}) = a_{jj} - a_{ii},$$

i.e.

$$\Delta(x)_{ji} = a_{jj} - a_{ii}.$$

On the other hand by the equality (3.3) we have that

$$\Delta(x)_{ji} = \delta_{ji}(x_{ji}) = \delta_{ji}(\mathbf{1}) = 0.$$

Thus $a_{jj} = a_{ii}$. Since $\delta(x_{ij}) = 0$ it follows that

$$\Delta(x)_{ij} = (a_{ii} - a_{jj})x_{ij} + \delta(x_{ij}) = 0,$$

i.e. $\Delta(x)_{ij} = 0$. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.11. *If* $i \neq j$ *then* $\Delta(x)_{ij} = 0$.

Proof. We take the element $y \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that $y_{ks} = x_{ks}$ if $(k, s) \neq (j, i)$ and $y_{ji} = \mathbf{1}$. Then by Lemma 3.10 it follows that $\Delta(y)_{ij} = 0$.

Consider a derivation $D = D_a + D_\delta$ on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\Delta(x) = D(x),\ \Delta(y) = D(y).$$

Then

$$\Delta(x)_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^{n} (a_{is}x_{sj} - x_{is}a_{sj}) + \delta(x_{ij})$$

and

$$\Delta(y)_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^{n} (a_{is}y_{sj} - y_{is}a_{sj}) + \delta(y_{ij}).$$

By construction $y_{ks} = x_{ks}$ for all $(k, s) \neq (j, i)$, and therefore

$$\Delta(x)_{ij} = \Delta(y)_{ij}.$$

But $\Delta(y)_{ij} = 0$, then $\Delta(x)_{ij} = 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

Now Lemmata 3.9 and 3.11 implies the following

Lemma 3.12. $\Delta \equiv 0$.

Proof of the Theorem 3.3. Let Δ be an arbitrary 2-local derivation on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$. By Lemma 3.4 there exists a derivation D on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$(\Delta - D)(e_{ij}) = 0$$

for all $i, j \in \overline{1, n}$. Therefore by Lemma 3.7 $\delta = (\Delta - D)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a derivation. Consider the 2-local derivation $\Delta_0 = \Delta - D - D_\delta$. Then $\Delta_0(e_{ij}) = 0$ for all i, j and $\Delta_0|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$. Therefore by Lemma 3.12 we get $\Delta_0 = 0$, i.e. $\Delta = D + D_\delta$. Thus Δ is a derivation. The proof is complete.

Let M be a von Neumann algebra and denote by $S(M)$ the algebra of measurable operators affiliated with M, and by $LS(M)$ the algebra of locally measurable operators affiliated with M. If M is of type I_∞ we have proved in [8] that every 2-local derivation on $LS(M)$ is a derivation. Theorem 3.3 enables us to extend this result for general type I case.

Let M be a von Neumann algebra of type I_n $(n \geq 2)$. Then $LS(M) = S(M)$ is $*$-isomorphic with the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, where $\mathcal{A} = L^0(\Omega)$ for an appropriate measure space (Ω, Σ, μ). Therefore each 2-local derivation on $LS(M)$ is a derivation. If M is an arbitrary finite von Neumann algebra of type I without abelian direct summands, then there exists a family $\{z_n\}_{n\geq 2}$ of central projections from M with $\sup z_n = \mathbf{1}$, such that the algebra M is $*$-isomorphic with the C^*-product of von Neumann algebras z_nM of type I_n, respectively $(n = 2, 3, \ldots)$. By [1, Proposition 1.1] we have that

$$LS(M) = S(M) \cong \prod_{n\geq 2} S(z_nM) \cong \prod_{n\geq 2} M_n(L^0(\Omega_n)),$$

for appropriate measure spaces $(\Omega_n, \Sigma_n, \mu_n)$, $n \geq 2$. Since each 2-local derivation on each $M_n(L^0(\Omega_n))$ is a derivation, Lemma 3.2 (1) implies

Theorem 3.13. *Let M be a finite von Neumann algebra of type I without abelian direct summands. Then every 2-local derivation on the algebra $LS(M) = S(M)$ is a derivation.*

Now combining this theorem with the mentioned result of [8] we obtain

Corollary 3.14. *If M is a type I von Neumann algebra without abelian direct summands then every 2-local derivation on the algebra $LS(M)$ is a derivation.*

Remark 3.15. The main results of the previous Section 2 (see Theorem 2.9) show that in the abelian case (i.e. for commutative von Neumann algebras) the properties of 2-local derivations on the algebra $LS(M) = S(M)$ are essentially different.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The second named author would like to acknowledge the hospitality of the Chern Institute of Mathematics, Nankai University (China).

REFERENCES

[1] S. Albeverio, Sh.A. Ayupov, K.K. Kudaybergenov, *Structure of derivations on various algebras of measurable operators for type I von Neumann algebras,* J. Func. Anal. **256** (2009), 2917–2943.

[2] S. Albeverio, Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, B. O. Nurjanov, *Local derivations on algebras of measurable operators*, Comm. in Contem. Math. **13** (2011), 643–657.

[3] Sh. A. Ayupov, *Derivations on algebras of measurable operators,* Dokl. Akad. Nauk R. Uzbekistan, **3** (2000), 14–17.

[4] Sh.A.Ayupov, F. Arzikulov, *2-local derivations on semi-finite von Neumann algebras,* arXiv:1207.4863 v1 [math.OA].

[5] Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, *Additive derivations on algebras of measurable operators*, J. Operator Theory, **67** (2012) 495–510.

[6] Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, 2*-local derivations and automorphisms on* $B(H)$, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **395** (2012), 15-18.

[7] Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, B. O. Nurjanov, A. K. Alauadinov, *Local and* 2*-local derivations on noncommutative Arens algebras*, Math. Slovaca (to appear), preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.1557

[8] Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, A. K. Alauadinov, 2*-Local derivations on algebras of locally measurable operators*, arXiv:1209.5154 v1 [math.OA].

[9] A.F. Ber, V.I. Chilin, F.A. Sukochev, *Non-trivial derivations on commutative regular algebras*, Extracta Math., **21** (2006), 107–147.

[10] A.F. Ber, *Derivations on commutative regular algebras*, Siberian Advances in Mathematics, **21** (2011), 161-169.

[11] M. Brešar, *Jordan derivations on semiprime rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104** (1988), 1003–1006.

[12] M. Brešar, P. Šemrl, *Mapping which preserve idempotents, local automorphisms, and local derivations*, Can. J. Math. **45** (1999), 483–496.

[13] B.E. Johnson, *Local derivations on* C^**-algebras are derivations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2000), 313–325.

[14] R. V. Kadison, *Local derivations*, J. Algebra. **130** (1990), 494–509.

[15] S. O. Kim, J. S. Kim, *Local automorphisms and derivations on* M_n, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **132** (2004), 1389–1392.

[16] A.G. Kusraev, *Automorphisms and derivations on a universally complete complex* f*-algebra*, Siberian Math. J. **47** (2006), 77–85.

[17] D. R. Larson, A. R. Sourour, *Local derivations and local automorphisms of* $B(X)$, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 51. Providence, Rhode Island, 1990, Part 2, 187–194.

[18] Y. Lin, T. Wong, *A note on* 2*-local maps*, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. **49** (2006), 701–708.

[19] J. Liu, N. Wong, *2-Local automorphisms of operator algebras*, J. Math. Anal. App. **321** (2006), 741–750.

[20] L. Molnar, *Local automorphisms of operator algebras on Banach spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (2003), 1867–1874.

[21] P. Semrl, *Local automorphisms and derivations on* $B(H)$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), 2677–2680.

[22] P. Semrl, *Local automorphisms of standard operator algebras*, J. Math. Anal. App. **371** (2010), 303–306.

[23] J. H. Zhang, H. X. Li, *2-Local derivations on digraph algebras*, Acta Math. Sinica, Chinese series **49** (2006), 1401–1406.

Institute of Mathematics National University of Uzbekistan, 100125 Tashkent, Uzbekistan and the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Trieste, Italy
E-mail address: `sh_ayupov@mail.ru`

Department of Mathematics, Karakalpak state university, Ch. Abdirov 1, 230113, Nukus, Uzbekistan
E-mail address: `karim2006@mail.ru`

Institute of Mathematics National University of Uzbekistan, 100125 Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail address: `amir_t85@mail.ru`